

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-47 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated December 12, 2006, claims 1-17 and 19-47 were rejected. With this amendment, Applicants have filed a request for continued examination. Applicants have canceled claims 1-17 and 19-47 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have added new claims 48-84, and now respectfully request consideration of the application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Objections to the Claims

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner has objected to claims 1, 25 and 29 because of informalities. Applicants have canceled claims 1, 25 and 29, thereby overcoming these objections.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

In the 5th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 3, 37-39 and 41-44 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have canceled claims 3, 37-39 and 41-44, thereby overcoming this rejection.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e)

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-9, 11, 15-16, 19-23, 25-26, 33-34, 36, 40 and 45 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,386 to Arun et al. (“Arun”). Applicants have canceled claims 1-2, 4-9, 11, 15-16, 19-23, 25-26, 33-34, 36, 40 and 45, thereby overcoming this rejection.

New claims 48, 55, 65 and 74 variously recite “generating a third version of the associative array by merging modifications from the first version of the associative array and the

second version of the associative array and resolving conflicts between the first version of the associative array and the second version of the associative array.” Hence, the claims recite generating a third version of an associative array that incorporates changes from a first version of the associative array and a second version of the associative array. This allows the associative array to be modified in different locations, or by different users, to generate different versions of the associative array. These different modifications are then later merged to generate a version of the associative array including the different modifications.

In contrast, Arun discloses a database version control system where a database table includes “at least some” records having “a version control field including version control information.” Arun, col. 3, lines 58-61. Specifically, in Arun, each row of a database table includes version management fields with identifying the version of the row and subsequent versions of the row. *See*, Arun, FIG. 2, col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 11. Thus, the version management fields describe a version tree indicating the relationship between different versions of the database and are used to retrieve data from different versions of the database. *See*, Arun, col. 6, line 63 to col. 7, line 4; col. 8, lines 40-60. Therefore, Arun does not disclose “merging modifications” from different versions of the database rows, but merely provides a simplified method for accessing different versions of the database rows. There is no disclosure in Arun of “generating a third version of the associative array by merging modifications from the first version of the associative array and the second version of the associative array and resolving conflicts between the first version of the associative array and the second version of the associative array,” as claimed.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 8th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 3, 10, 12-14, 17, 24, 27-32, 35, 37-39, 41-44 and 46-47 as allegedly being unpatentable over Arun in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,684,990 to Boothby (“Boothby”). Applicants have canceled claims 3, 10, 12-14, 17, 24, 27-32, 35, 37-39, 41-44 and 46-47, thereby overcoming this rejection.

Boothby does not remedy the deficient disclosure of Arun. Rather, Boothby discloses a method for synchronizing two or more databases. *See* Boothby, col. 3, lines 16-23. In Boothby, a status file containing all of the data in two databases and is used to generate a set of updating decisions used to modify each database. *See* Boothby, col. 3, lines 24-33. The set of updating decisions is then used to generate a “To-Do List” specifying how to modify the contents of each database. *See* Boothby, col. 6, lines 19-38. Hence, Boothby does not disclose “generating a third version of the associative array by merging modifications from the first version of the associative array and the second version of the associative array and resolving conflicts between the first version of the associative array and the second version of the associative array,” but merely discloses modifying multiple databases using a generated set of instructions.

Hence, Arun and Boothby, both alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest the new claims.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 48-84, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and requests allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Lawrence W. McVoy, et al.

Dated: April 12, 2007

By: /Brian G. Brannon/
Brian G. Brannon, Registration No. 57,219
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7610
Fax: (650) 938-5200

24584/11968/DOCS/1698607.5